

### REMARKS

Claims 1-48 remain in this application, with Claims 16 and 29 amended and new Claims 32-48 added. Applicants respectfully request review and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The Examiner objected to Claim 16 due to improper dependency. The claim has now been corrected in the above amendments. The Examiner also rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Applicants have amended the claim to clarify the structural relationships, and the claim is now deemed sufficiently definite.

Before addressing the merits of the rejections based on prior art, Applicants provide the following brief description of the invention. The present invention allows a client to maintain state with a web application on a remote server while protecting the user's security and privacy. Generally, the client generates a unique identifier that is transmitted to web applications during transactions. The web applications are then able to use this identifier to monitor and maintain a record of the user's current transaction status. However, this identifier can be reset to disable the web application's ability to further track the user's behavior. Notably, the identifier uses location information in order to uniquely identify the client.

In an embodiment of the present invention, the client receives location and temporal values from a global positioning system ("GPS") receiver. The location value corresponds to the geographic location of the client. Generally, this value includes latitude, longitude, and altitude information. The temporal value corresponds to the time at which the user invoked the current Internet browser session. The client reformats these values into character strings of known lengths and then concatenates them together into a single character string to generate a unique state variable. To make the state variable anonymous, the client then mathematically encodes the characters of the unique state variable, which removes information specific to the client from the identifier. The client then transmits this state variable as an http header with each uniform

resource locator ("URL") request. The remote server receiving these requests compares the state variable to a database to determine if the user has a current transaction status that should be taken into account in the server's response. When the user terminates the current browser session, the client deletes the state variable, thereby preventing the remote server's ability to monitor the user's activity in future transactions. Thus, the remote server is able to provide the user with more functionality than it otherwise would be able to offer operating in a stateless protocol, while also providing enhanced security over the conventional use of cookies that allow the server to continuously monitor client behavior.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 10-13, 15-17, 24-27 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Phelan. The Examiner also rejected Claims 4, 14, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Phelan in view of Murphy, and rejected Claims 5-9 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Phelan in view of Wood et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Phelan discloses a system that allows an Internet user to access resources within a defined geographic region. As shown in Fig. 3, a client computer 10 communicates with a map server 11 and plural "overlay" information servers 12. The client computer 10 sends a map request to the map server 11, such as by communicating location coordinates, and the map server 11 responds by providing an image file comprising a map that is then displayed on the screen of the client computer 10. The client computer 10 also communicates information requests to one or more information servers 12, such as pertaining to banks, fast food restaurants, hotels, etc., and these servers respond by providing an HTML document identifying icons and respective screen positions. The client computer 10 then overlays the map on the display with icons reflecting the corresponding locations of the services that were requested, as shown in Fig. 2.

The Examiner refers to a portion of the reference that indicates that the map and overlay information can be "persistent", and in particular, refers to the use of cookies

stored on the client computer that include the location coordinates. The reference does not disclose how these cookies would be used, but it should be apparent that the cookies are not used to maintain state between the client and the servers. Instead, the cookie information seems intended merely to aid in the communication of location coordinates to the servers, and not for maintaining "state" as that term is generally understood in the art.

More particularly, none of the servers described in the reference have a need to maintain a record of transactions with the client computer, and are thus "stateless." Each "transaction" that the client computer makes with a server comprises a single request for information. For example, the client computer 10 requests a map from the map server 11, then requests restaurant location information from one information server 12, then requests bank information from another information 12, etc. There is never a need for the client computer 10 to go back to the same server for additional information requests, unless of course the location of the client computer changes, in which case the "persistent" information in the cookie is rendered invalid. Moreover, each request initiated by the client computer 10 goes to a different server that may be operated by another company in an entirely different location. There is no reason (and hence no disclosure in the reference) of any one server needing to know the transaction state from another server. Indeed, the reference provides that either the map request or the information request could come first, i.e., the order makes no difference (see col. 7, lines 53-55), thereby emphasizing the "stateless" nature of their transactions and teaching away from the maintenance of state by any one server.

With respect to the claims, Phelan fails to suggest or disclose, *inter alia*, the step of "utilizing said state variable to maintain state between said client and said server," as defined in Claim 1. Likewise, Phelan fails to suggest or disclose, *inter alia*, "means for utilizing said state variable to maintain state between said client and said server," as defined in Claims 15 and 29. As discussed above, Phelan teaches and discloses no maintenance of state between the client and server. The rejection of these claims, and

all claims dependent thereon, should therefore be withdrawn.

The Examiner cites Murphy solely for the disclosure of a location value including an altitude dimension. Murphy discloses a decryption module that includes a Satellite Positioning System (SATPS) antenna and signal receiver/processor. Murphy does not disclose the use of location in a state variable for maintaining state between a client and server, and therefore fails to make up for the deficiencies of Phelan discussed above. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the references as proposed in view of the clearly unrelated subject matter of the two references.

The Examiner cites Wood et al. for the disclosure of a state variable having a temporal dimension and also the mathematically encoding of the state variable. As a fundamental matter, Wood et al. does not disclose a state variable that includes location information, and therefore fails to make up for the deficiencies of Phelan discussed above. Further, Wood et al. discloses an architecture in which a persistent session credential is created for use over multiple accesses to one or more information resources. This teaches directly away from the present invention, which in certain embodiments seeks to avoid entirely the security issues pertaining to maintaining persistency over multiple sessions by deleting the state variable upon completion of a session.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims as obvious over combinations of Phelan with Murphy and/or Wood et al. should also be withdrawn. It is further noted that new Claims 32-48 are directed to related aspects of the invention that are similarly neither suggested nor disclosed by the references of record.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-48 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Serial No. 09/880,308  
December 1, 2004  
Page 13

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a one-month extension of time, extending to December 2, 2004, the period for response to the Office Action dated August 2, 2004. A check in the amount of \$55.00 is enclosed for the one-month extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR §1.17(a)(1). Also our check in the amount of \$197.00 is enclosed for the later presentation of one independent claim in excess of three (\$44.00), pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.16(b), and for the later presentation of seventeen total claims in excess of twenty (\$153.00), pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.16(c). The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Brian M. Berliner  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 34,549

Date: December 1, 2004

**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899  
Telephone: (213) 430-6000